Application No. 10/625,876 (Beard) Reply to O.A. of October 4, 2007

# Remarks

Applicant has reviewed and considered the office action dated October 4, 2007 and the references cited therein.

### **Priority**

To the extent the applicant is able by law, the applicant claims priority to NZ Patent Application number 509524

# Rejection under 35 USC 102

The applicants claims were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being unpatentable over Brumfield (US7228289).

The applicant submits the principal difference between Brumfield and the invention is that our invention allows the trader to see one or more pieces of data associated with a given price graphically, where Brumfield only teaches how to show one piece of data graphically.

For example, in Figure 4 of Brumfield, 452 shows the last traded quantity at a given price in the market. By comparison, in Figure 3 of our invention, 140 shows a multiplicity of recent trade quantities (140A, 140B). By showing multiple recent trade volumes at a given price level, our invention tells the trader more information about the state of the market:

Similarly, in Figure 4 of Brumfield, 406 and 408 show total Ask/Bid quantities numerically, but not graphically. In Figure 3 of our invention, 120 shows the total Ask/Bid quantities graphically, but also shows the quantities associated with each broker (120A, 120B, 120C).

Application No. 10/625,876 (Beard) Reply to O.A. of October 4, 2007

Brumfield has no analogue of the time-based buying/selling time schedule shown in figure 5 of our invention.

# Rejection under 35 USC 103

The applicant submits the invention is non-obvious over the cited prior art for the same reasons outlined above.

# Conclusion

For the above reasons, the Applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentability over the prior art, for at least the reasons set forth above. Therefore we submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action we respectfully solicit.

#### Conditional Request for Constructive Assistance

Applicants have amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. §2173.02 and §707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this

006433888146

Application No. 10/625,876 (Beard) Reply to O.A. of October 4, 2007

application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

# Petition for Extension of Time

A Petition for Extension of Time for three (3) months has been filed herewith, with the Credit Card form, duly authorized for payment of the \$525.00 fee (Small Entity status claimed).

#### Certificate of Facsimile Transmission

I certify that on the date below I will fax this communication, and any attachments, if any, to Group Art Unit 3693 of the Patent and Trademark Office at +1 571 273 8300.

Date: April 4, 2008 (US date)

Applicant's Signature:

Respectfully submitted,

COMPUDIGM SERVICES INC. Customer Number 37942

By:

Savvas Kerdemelidis In-house Legal Counsel